

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending. Claims 1-13, the specification and drawings have been amended. No new matter has been added.

In paragraph 1, the Office Action objects to Fig. 1 as illustrating only that which is old. In response, Applicant has amended the sheet bearing Fig. 1 to include the legend -- Prior Art --.

In paragraph 2, the Office Action objects to the disclosure for containing embedded hyperlinks. In response, Applicant has amended paragraphs [0002] and [0004] to delete the hyperlinks. Applicant has also amended paragraph [0038] to change the word "row" to "column," to match that which is disclosed in Fig. 3.

In paragraph 3, the Office Action objects to claims 1, 3, 10, 12 and 13 for informalities. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 10, 12 and 13 to eliminate the informalities noted in paragraph 3 of the Office Action.

In paragraphs 4-5 of the Office Action, claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1 to recite that the mobile subscriber network comprises "a subscriber information administration server," which is an apparatus, and claim 8 to recite that the method is "for a mobile subscriber network comprising a plurality of circuits." Thus, both the apparatus claim 1 and method claim 8, as amended, are associated with machines, and as such, are statutory subject matter because "it is tied to a particular machine or apparatus." *In re Bilski*, No. 2007-1130 (Fed. Cir., October 30, 2008) (*en banc*). The U.S. Supreme Court has stated that patentable subject matter has been interpreted to be "anything under the sun that is made by man." *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. 303 (1980). What may not be patented has been identified by the Supreme Court as "laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas." *Id.* at 309. The present invention is not claiming any of these non-patentable subjects. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

In paragraphs 6-7 of the Office Action, claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0064730 (Chen). Applicant traverses.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Chen are the requirements for “a subscriber information administration server that manages terminations for a plurality of circuits, comprising a circuit administration table for retaining a many-versus-one correspondence between the plurality of circuits and a subscriber . . . wherein the server updates said circuit administration table to reflect a resource allocation of each circuit.” Among the limitations of independent claim 8 that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Chen are the requirements for “retaining information of a one-versus-many correspondence between a subscriber and circuits in the plurality of circuits” and “allocating each circuit in the plurality of circuits based upon said circuit administration table.”

Chen is directed to proportionally reducing bandwidth in a mobile network when required, based on different classes of service. In Figs. 12A and B, Chen illustrates reallocation of bandwidth between three user terminals (A, B and C) for a *single* subscriber. Notably, no communications circuits are disclosed in Figs. 12A and B, as the tables do not have rows comprising subscriber identifiers and circuit identifiers. *Cf.*, Applicant’s Fig. 3, columns 1 and 4. In Fig. 1, Chen illustrates a radio node controller circuit that, in signal multiplexing circuit block 111, multiplexes several signals for transmission to mobile handset(s) 20. Chen fails to disclose a subscriber information administration server/resource administration method that retains “a many-versus-one correspondence between [a] plurality of circuits and a subscriber,” as required by the independent claims. Further, as illustrated in Figs. 12A and B, Chen merely discloses allocation of bandwidth to individual user terminals, not allocation of circuits to subscribers who provide communications services to the user terminals, as required by independent claims 1 and 8. In the absence of any disclosure or suggestion of these features of the invention, independent claims 1 and 8 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Dependent claims 2-7 and 9-13 depend from independent claims 1 and 8, and incorporate by reference all of the limitations found in the independent claims from which they depend, and are also allowable for the same reasons discussed above. In addition, these dependent claims include further limitations which, in combination with the limitations incorporated by reference, are neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record, and are therefore further allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 20, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Robert G. Gingher

Registration No.: 45,755

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 277-6500

Attorneys for Applicant

PRIOR ART

FIG. 1

